UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The New Allied Front

Russia, sadder but wiser, is now pitted against Nazi Germany and so belongs to the new and larger allied front. Other systems differ in many respects from the democratic way of life, but Nazism is basically and totally antithetical to every principle of democracy. The Nazi philosophy and program is a menace of world proportions and cannot be confined to Europe. Hence, any government anywhere and of whatever kind that is in conflict with Nazi Germany is to that extent and for present purposes an ally of British and American democracy. But already American appeasers of Nazi Germany have launched agitation for "European unity" against "Asiatic Communism," and American isolationists have renewed their cry that what happens between foreign governments is none of our business. This is fallacious and dangerous. While Russia's entrance into the war makes even more likely the ultimate defeat of Germany, still there should be no let-up in the stream of American aid flowing to Great Britain. Now is the opportune time to strike and strike hard at the Third Reich on the western front, to give all possible aid to Russia on the long battle line of the eastern front, and to guard the home front against isolationists, appeasers, and defeatists.

Curtis W. Reese.

VOLUME CXXVII NUMBER 5

Chicago, July, 1941

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Declaration

In this time of growing tension of opinion and intolerance of spirit, it is appropriate that UNITY should reaffirm its position as a journal of liberal opinion.

UNITY is interested in no political party or platform, is bound to no school of philosophy or theology, is the organ of no sect or denomination, and is the voice of no organized movement. Rather is UNITY dedicated to certain underlying principles, namely, freedom, fellowship, and character in religion. It seeks the fulfilment of certain ideals, namely, representative democracy, peace, brotherhood, the commonwealth of man which is the kingdom of God on earth.

In dedication to its principles and in pursuit of its ideals, UNITY maintains the rule of liberty. Its editors, editorial contributors, and correspondents speak with unfettered freedom the convictions of their own minds within the general framework of a journal of liberal opinion. The writers of articles, reviews, and poems present their own ideas, which may, at times, be at variance with those of the editors. UNITY would repress no utterance and control no argument that is competent and honest, for it is skeptical of conformity and averse to authority, which always tend to hamper individual liberty. It is happy in those diversities of gifts and ideas which are the glory of the one spirit.

In this period of trial and crisis, UNITY would unite anew its editors and readers in the service of *Character* which is the substance of religion, *Freedom* which is its life, and *Fellowship* which is its goal. Thus would we vindicate our country, our civilization, our culture, religious and lay, in a period when all alike are threatened with extinction.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorials—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 71
The Beginnings of a New World—CURTIS W. REESE 74

ARTICLES—

Masaryk—An Unforgettable Character—HENRY HERBATSCHEK 77
Good Will and Intellectual Power—VICTOR S. YARROS 78
Freedom for India—HILDA WIERUM BOULTER 79
A Pro-American Thinks Aloud—HELEN B. ANTHONY 81
Democracy—ELMO A. ROBINSON 82
Heroes of Peace—EDMUND L. SOUDER 82

POETRY—

Free India!—RALPH CHEYNEY 80
To W. H. Auden—ALBERT AND HELEN FOWLER 83

THE STUDY TABLE—

Unity in Religious Pluralism—JAMES M. YARD 84
From Nebraska to New England—C. A. HAWLEY 84

THE FIELD—

American Peace Aims—*World Alliance News Letter* 70
Personals 70

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

American Peace Aims

In a speech on May 18 Secretary of State Cordell Hull set forward five basic principles for guiding the post-war world. The principles he enunciated are briefly as follows:

1. Extreme nationalism must not again be permitted to express itself in excessive trade restrictions.
2. Nondiscrimination in international commercial relations must be the rule, so that international trade may grow and prosper.
3. Raw material supplies must be available to all nations without discrimination.
4. International agreements regulating the supply of commodities must be so handled as to protect fully the interests of the consuming countries and their people.
5. The institutions and arrangements of international finance must be so set up that they lend aid to the essential enterprises and the continuous development of all countries and permit the payment through processes of trade consonant with the welfare of all countries.

—*World Alliance News Letter.*

Personals

The Reverend Edwin H. Wilson, pastor of the Third Unitarian Church of Chicago since 1932, has accepted a call to the pastorate of the First Unitarian Society of Schenectady, New York.

* * *

The Reverend Robert E. Romig has accepted a call to the Unitarian Congregational Society in Syracuse, New York. For the past five years Mr. Romig has been minister of the Unitarian Church in Duluth, Minnesota.

* * *

The Reverend Lon Ray Call, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference since 1935, will join the staff of the American Unitarian Association, September 1, as minister-at-large.

* * *

Dr. Curtis W. Reese, for the past four years President of the Adult Education Council of Chicago, has resigned and has been succeeded by Dr. Ellsworth Faris, professor of sociology in the University of Chicago.

* * *

At the recent Commencement of the Meadville Theological School, the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon the Reverend Henry Wilder Foote of Belmont, Massachusetts, and the Reverend David Rhys Williams of Rochester, New York.

* * *

The Reverend George H. P. Williams, associate minister of the Church of the Christian Union, Rockford, Illinois, has joined the faculty of the Pacific Unitarian School for the Ministry.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVII JULY, 1941 No. 5

EDITORIALS

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Now at last we know that this is a war for democracy, and freedom, and human decency, and the sanctities of civilization, and the American way of life! Can there be any doubt about these things, now that Russia is fighting against Germany? With the greatest totalitarian state in the world at war against Hitler and thus on the side of Britain, does not this conflict become as clearly a struggle for liberty against tyranny as the first World War when the Tsar clasped hands with France and England against the Kaiser? What a wonderful man Joseph Stalin is—so just in his rule, so exalted in his purposes, so ardent in his service of progress and enlightenment! His government—is it not the freest on this planet, and his people the happiest of any people anywhere? Truly, we have been unjust to Russia; and must recognize, as we have not recognized, that the Soviets are indeed the friends and champions of all we stand for in this country. And look at what other things are now made plain to us! The Hon. Winston Churchill, for example, the relentless foe of Russia, the fierce hater of the Bolsheviks, who has said as terrible things against the "Reds" as ever Hitler himself has mouthed! He has discovered his mistake, and is now "all-out" for Red Russia. See him as he clasps Stalin to his bosom, and pledges him aid and comfort forever. And the Communists, who have been so bitterly opposed to this war against Germany, and have been denounced as such a dangerously subversive influence in this country—behold, how the scene has changed! Suddenly, within an hour, the Communists are all in favor of the war, all for getting America into the fight against the Nazis—and good patriotic Americans are now acclaiming these Communists as among our best citizens, after all. Well, well, what a whirligig this Russian-German war has made! As I survey the disgusting spectacle, I wonder if there is anybody left who can really take war seriously. Where is the man who will stand up now and say that war is ever honest and righteous—or that this war is serving any good end of freedom? If ever I felt justified in everything that I have preached against this whole damnable and silly business, it is at this hour.

II

> As a Christian I see no possibility of reconciliation between the central teachings of Jesus and the necessary operations of war; as a loyal citizen, devoted to the cause of liberty and democracy, I am unalterably opposed to the present threatened belligerency of this country. Both as a citizen and a Christian, therefore, I must in loyalty to conscience affirm my pledge not to use my ministry to bless, sanction, or support war.

This brief and decisive statement was published a fortnight ago over the signatures of one thousand ministers of Protestant churches in all parts of this country. It was written, sponsored, and circulated by a group of leading New York clergymen who declared as early as 1935 that "the gospel leaves us no other choice but to refuse to sanction or participate in war." These men are now joined by a thousand of their brethren in issuing the above statement under the threat and challenge of the present hour. Look carefully, please, at what this statement says! From the Christian viewpoint there is "no possibility of reconciliation between the central teachings of Jesus and the necessary operations of war." That is categorical—no reservations, or exceptions, or compromises! Christianity and war are incompatible. If you support one, you cannot support the other. Secondly, from the American standpoint, there is dictated a fundamental opposition between "liberty and democracy" on the one hand and "the present threatened belligerency of this country" on the other. There are citizens who insist that we should go to war to defend "liberty and democracy," but these ministers will have nothing of this madness. Lastly, there is in this statement the solemn "pledge not to use [the] ministry to bless, sanction, or support war." Which being interpreted means opposition to war under all conditions! A thousand ministers signed this statement. But more remarkable than the number of these men is their character and position. Beginning with Fosdick, Buttrick, Chalmers, Sockman, Tittle, Palmer, McKee, and running down through the hundreds who follow on, the list reads like a Who's Who

of the Protestant clergy of this country. This is the Christianity of America speaking. This is the conscience of America speaking. It is the church taking its rightful place as the judge of the world, and declaring gloriously its independence of government and state. Let presidents follow in the pathway of fuehrers and duces and premiers if they will—the ministers of religion will not follow. Rather will they walk humbly and determinedly in the footsteps of Jesus, even though this leads to the cross. If one would have cheer in this black hour, one need only realize that there was nothing like this in the last war. The pacifists then were few and lonely. Now they are a mighty host. The cause of peace is marching on. War is being cast back into the hell from which it came and to which it belongs.

III

It is interesting to look back a month to the President's much-tooted May 27th speech, and see how completely ineffective to its purpose it was. Never was a speech given such a build-up, and never did a speech fall so flat. The President was to convince us once for all that we were in peril of our national life, and must fight—and he played upon our fears like a small boy shouting "fire" in a crowded theatre. But the people didn't scare a little bit! The June 19th Gallup Poll showed 79 per cent for "staying out" of this war. Then the President was to silence all opposition—deal with the arguments of the non-interventionists so conclusively as to leave them gasping and helpless. But Colonel Lindbergh made his most convincing address two days after the President spoke; Senators Wheeler, Taft, Johnson, Walsh, and Nye thundered replies that completely blanketed the presidential utterance, and the Keep America Out of War Congress had a success with its Washington meetings which would have been impossible had the President not himself prepared the way. Above all, Mr. Roosevelt in his May 27th speech was to unify the nation. We had been divided long enough in the face of the enemy. Now we must get together, and the President's dulcet radio voice was the call that all would answer. But it didn't work that way at all! Within twenty-four hours, no less than forty senators, under the lead of La Follette, had announced their steadfast opposition to the war policies of the White House; and so great had been the volume of public protest following the speech, that the President himself summoned the newspaper correspondents to his desk, and put on the soft pedal. It is my conviction that no event in modern times is so significant as the refusal of the great body of the American people to be stampeded into this war. If you want a vindication of democracy, here it is! Our most popular president, resorting to every device of propaganda, appealing to every base motive of fear and self-interest, has failed completely to shake the public resolve to peace. One thing is certain—that, if we go into this war, it will be because we are dragged into it, forced into it, by such an exercise of one-man dictatorial power as has not been seen in our time outside Hitler's Germany. Is that why the President declared an "unlimited emergency"?

IV

> I am writing just after reading the speech of Mr. Stimson, the United States Secretary of War, in which he told the American nation that it must use its navy, "at whatever risk," to ensure that supplies reach Great Britain. My immediate reaction to this is "America will be actually at war before midsummer." Such a belief is not uttered with any gusto or satisfaction. It just seems the inevitable outcome of the course which is being pursued. Alas that the one great free nation which might have remained a home of sanity and freedom and whose leader might have been able to bring the warring nations together on some common basis of discussion, out of which a negotiated peace might have been forthcoming, should have become involved in the overcoming of evil by evil means. I recognize the almost insuperable difficulties and complications with which America has been and is being faced, and the fact that she does not accept the Christian pacifist position. Notwithstanding this, I believe she might have stood for sanity and justice without war, and helped to lead this poor old world out of the impassé of the past months and years.

This is a letter of an Englishman, written from London underneath the bombs, and published in this country in the *Friends Intelligencer*. It emphasizes what I regard as basic in the case for keeping America out of the European war. All too much and too often have the anti-war advocates in this country talked in terms of nationalistic self-interest. I suppose that this is natural, since it is self-interest that is predominant in this world. Germany is serving her own interest in fighting this war. England is doing the same. Why shouldn't America serve *her* interest in turn by staying out of a war with which she has no concern and in which she can gain nothing and perhaps lose everything? This is an absolutely sound argument. But it is an argument on a low plane. Just like the argument on the other side that we should go into this war to save England as our first line of defense! But why should we think of ourselves primarily? "America first"? No!—humanity first!! And this idealistic consideration dictates one line of policy, as the above English correspondent so clearly sees. *That we shall remain at peace*, not because this is in our interest but because it is in the interest of the world! Nothing is more fallacious than the idea that we in this country can accomplish any good for mankind—or for ourselves, for that matter!—by joining the armed forces against Germany. We can only insure thereby the indefinite continuance of the war, and an ending of the struggle not by negotiation, but by exhaustion, mutual defeat, and universal catastrophe and chaos. If *we* become a belligerent, the last hope is gone. But if we stay out, then we can use all our incomparable strength and influence on behalf of peace. We can end the war before it is too late. What the world needs in this dread hour is leadership away from violence back to "sanity and justice." America alone among the nations can offer this leadership—but only if she herself remains at peace.

V

The Director of Relief in Continental Europe for the American Friends Service Committee, Howard E. Kershner, came home the other day. Speaking of unoccupied France where he had been working, Mr. Kershner said that "starvation, want and destitution are rampant." Suffering from lack of food in this region is general. More persons are dying of starvation than is recognized since "deaths are being attributed to other causes because people weak from undernourishment fall prey to all kinds of diseases." Then, referring to the work of the Friends in feeding a meal a day to 50,000 children in Free France, and providing half a liter of milk daily to 10,000 babies, Mr. Kershner declared that they could feed a million children and more "if we had the money." What to do about this horror, general throughout Europe in occupied and unoccupied countries alike? The remedy? This Quaker relief agent had an answer—*"the end of the war."* If this war goes on, millions of innocent and helpless people are going to starve. If this war goes on, babies and little children are going to die like flies. If this war goes on, starvation is going to creep like smouldering fire from country to country, all the way from the English Channel to the Ukraine, from the North Cape to Sicily, and in the wake of starvation will follow disease and pestilence. What used to happen in besieged cities is now happening on a whole continent. For starvation of civilian populations, like the bombing of civilian populations, is now a weapon of war. And there are those who want this war to go on until Adolf Hitler is beaten! How long do you think it is going to take to beat Adolf Hitler? Talk now, in highly optimistic circles, is 1944 or 1945. Ex-Ambassador Cudahy, returning from Germany the other day, spoke of thirty years, like the Thirty Years' War. And how much do you think will be left of the European population in five, ten, twenty, thirty years? If "starvation [is] rampant" in unoccupied France now, what will it be next winter, and the winter after next winter, and the winter after the winter after next winter? No remedy except *"the end of the war"!* The pacifists are realistic enough to see this. Altogether apart from the question of ideals, they would stop this war to save humanity. But the non-pacifists are bent on suicide—or rather murder, for it is the other folks who do the dying!

VI

Some of the things that are being said these days are interesting, especially as indicating the growing spirit of fear and hate in which the peace, if any, will be made after this war. Ponder the following, culled from the newspapers and magazines during a period of three weeks in June! Ben Tillett, English Labor leader, described the Nazis as "the bloodiest murderers hell had ever let loose," and said that England must fight until she wiped them out. * * * Dean Gildersleeve, of Barnard College, in her commencement address, declared that those who, "like Mr. Lindbergh," opposed the President's policies, are "approaching perilously near to treason." * * * Raymond Clapper, Washington columnist, wrote recently that free speech can go too far, and that the actions of the America First Committee "amount in effect to encouraging sedition." * * * A Congressman, indignant over strikes in defense industries, called for the electric chair for workers thus guilty of treason. * * * Prime Minister Churchill, in a radio address quoted in the *Friends Intelligencer* (June 7th), referred to the German people as "70,000,000 Huns, some curable and others killable." * * * Hailing the Anglo-Free French invasion of Syria, the New York *Herald-Tribune* hoped that the action would be carried through "with whatever ruthlessness is required." * * * Margaret Gorrell, writing in the New York *Herald-Tribune,* would "leave as it is the destruction wrought on Rotterdam, Belgrade, Warsaw, Coventry—the ruined, irreplaceable treasures of St. Paul's, the ancient City of London, the Temple, and the like. Add a concentration camp or two. These shall stand as a monument to Nazi culture. Over them all place statues of contemporary Americans who apparently do not condemn such actions." * * * The Reverend Ralph S. Meadowcroft, in a sermon at All Angels' Protestant Episcopal Church in New York, described the isolationists in this country as "the sons of Cain." * * * Prince Consort Bernhard of the Netherlands, on a recent visit to America, declared that there would be "no German re-birth after war defeat. Since the Germans have gone along [with Hitler], they are going to have to take what is coming to them." * * * John Thomas Taylor, the American Legion's national legislative representative, denounced "some labor groups [that] have been guilty of treason and nothing less than treason." Such is the spirit which is now dominating this country and the world! The longer the war goes on, the more it generates bitterness, hatred, and cruelty in the hearts of men. And in the atmosphere of these emotions will the peace be made! Can there be any question as to what kind of a peace this will be?

VII

The war insanity continues full blast. Dr. A. J. Carlson, past President of the American Association of University Professors and now a member of the faculty of Chicago University, says that this state of mind is like alcoholic drunkenness, only worse. People get drunk because it is the cheapest way to feel as though they owned the world. Professor Carlson thinks that people go to war for much the same reason. Hence the incredible things that are done these days! Look at these specimens: Claude Wichard, Secretary of Agriculture, told the farmers "we had better take risks on getting aid to England than to risk tank attacks on our

fields." * * * Norman Thomas was refused permission to speak on the campus of Ohio University because of the "unlimited national emergency." * * * Colonel Lindbergh was denied the right to address a public audience at the Academy of Music in Philadelphia, and Ex-Governor Phil LaFollette was barred from the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh. * * * Newark, New Jersey, a city of 428,000 inhabitants, had an experimental black-out, with air-raid signals, fire wardens, state troopers, block leaders, and all the other fancy trimmings. * * * Westchester County, New York, is enrolling all its citizens in a volunteer home defense organization, since it is felt that a Nazi attack upon New York City would be based on Westchester! * * * A Boston sanitary engineer was brought to Kennebunk, Maine, a town of some 3,600 people, to give instructions for keeping pure the water supply in case of sabotage or bombings. * * * Private Richard Drabble of Troop B, 102nd Essex Cavalry, has been transferred to the Signal Corps to experiment in training hawks to kill enemy messenger pigeons. * * * A newly organized Junior Committee of Bundles for Britain at the Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School, near Washington, is collecting from the students donations of powder, perfume, lipstick, hairpins, bobbypins, nail files, and other toilet articles. "The women of England can maintain high morale," say the girls, "only as long as they keep their noses powdered." * * * The presence of swarming fireflies in the night shadows is proving a source of worry to citizens' committees interested in black-outs. * * * The *Saturday Review of Literature* reports a growing tendency in schools and colleges to give up the teaching of German. Just like the last war! * * * New York City is recruiting 62,011 fire wardens, citizen volunteers, who are to patrol the city, watch out for enemy bombers, extinguish incendiary bombs, etc. Well, it's a great game, this war game—more exciting, and certainly more novel, than getting drunk or burning up the automobile highways. Perhaps it's just as well to let the children play!

EDITORIAL

THE BEGINNINGS OF A NEW WORLD

CURTIS W. REESE

At a time like this when the world that we know appears to be coming to an end seems to me to be a good time to assess our resources, to examine social trends, and to face our basic problems with the utmost frankness. This we must do not only to save ourselves from the dark gloom that hovers over the earth, but also to equip ourselves for valiant and intelligent grappling with the tasks that lie ahead.

I am well aware of the long catalog of current evils, of the devastation that stalks abroad, and of the mad men who threaten everything that free men hold dear. These things frighten all of us and terrify many of us, but they must not be allowed to paralyze us into submission or blind us to the glow of hope on distant horizons.

So sure am I that we are in the midst of the beginnings of a grand new world, or at least that we have the makings of one, that I am willing to take the risk of appearing to be an intellectual pollyanna in pointing out (1) the assets that are available in the building of a new world; (2) the dominant trends that lend themselves to the process; and (3) the problems that must be faced and that can be solved.

Despite social maladjustments, ethnocentric bigotry, and international brigandage, it is still possible and needful to take a long look in a true perspective for the larger factors of social and spiritual change that will finally dominate the world scene. Mankind will be saved and the future will be built not by the tender-minded who collapse at the first onslaught of ugly facts but by the tough-minded who get hold of the far-reaching values that constitute the foundations of the world that is yet to be.

In addition to such values as have long since proved themselves of permanent worth in the life of mankind, there are today certain major assets that are relatively new or that are only now beginning to be recognized as of underlying importance. These include the philosophy of human well-being as the criterion of social judgments, the science of the relationship between means and ends, the technological mastery of the processes of nature by inventive genius, and the art of administration.

I do not, of course, claim that the idea of human well-being has not been a concern of religious philosophies of the past. What I do claim is that this idea has been subordinated to other values to such an extent that it has been all but lost from view. Cosmic purposes, universal values, and other-worldly abstractions have until recently been the objects of major religious concern. But now, to an increasing degree, for serious and enlightened persons of all cultures, the thought of human well-being is the touchstone of their thinking. Philosophies and institutions are being judged as never before, not by antiquity of status but by their contribution to the lives of persons and to the quality of human living. This is true in general literature even more than in theological and philosophical treatises, and in the minds of the multitudes human well-being is becoming the dominant criterion of social judgments however un-

scientific may be their conception of human welfare.

The idea of human well-being is a conception that may overarch conflicting philosophies and undergird trends toward unity in things of the spirit. It is a value with bone and sinew in its makeup and which, if followed through to its logical conclusion, may well dethrone artificial systems of thought based on abstractions, and aid mightily in the building of a philosophy of humanity based on realizable goods. Increasingly, the most venerable of ideas and institutions will be called before the bar of social judgment. A great teacher of long ago was pre-eminently right when he said: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

Another asset in the building of a new world is the growing prevalence of the scientific spirit and method; that is, the spirit of free inquiry and the method of objective and controlled procedure. One need not make a god of science in order to appreciate the fact that no other procedure yet evolved can rival that of science in the search for facts, in the analysis of situations, in the relation of means to ends, and in the prediction and control of consequences. If this asset has been misused, it is because we have not yet oriented it to human well-being and have not yet become fully acquainted with its possibilities for good. Science in the hands of demagogues or dictators can destroy the world but science in the hands of an intelligent and socially-minded generation can remake the world according to the pattern of the heart's desire.

As evidence of what might be, we have but to cite a third asset, namely the achievements of technology in the mastery of the forces of nature in the last generation or so. In the development of the arts and the instrumentalities of civilization, technology has within a relatively brief period demonstrated that what appeared to be the wildest hopes could become current reality. I refuse to believe that man, who is able to achieve such precision and speed, such beauty and grandeur of design, is unable to turn his inventive genius to more worthy ends than those of slaughter and destruction. Indeed, man has already raised the level of existence to a point where we now regard as scandalous things that were once all but universal and that passed practically unnoticed. We now know that human drudgery and poverty are evils that need not be continued, and there is good reason to believe that man will not continue to tolerate them.

Another major asset of our time is the highly developed art of administration. In earlier times only in military science, and more recently in business affairs, was the art of administration sufficiently understood to be an asset available for the general good. But in our time, administration as such has flowered into public administration and we now know how to coördinate materials, persons, and processes, and to marshal them for desired public purposes. To the extent that we are still administratively frustrated, we have only ourselves to blame for not availing ourselves of the knowledge and the skill that lie within the reach of even the most isolated communities. The universities and the special administration service organizations have a wealth of information and skilled experts subject to summons.

We have at our disposal today assets which if utilized can make of the world of the future a thing of beauty and nobility beyond the dreams of the prophets and the seers who had no such instrumentalities with which to build the world of their dreams.

Up from the past and out of the present, there are emerging certain major and significant trends in social theory and practice which to some seem to indicate the doom of all things but which to me seem to offer great promise for the new world. Among these trends are the passing of the old individualism, the emergence of corporate enterprise, the recognition by government of its primary responsibility for the well-being of persons and society, and the steady growth of planetary consciousness.

The old rank individualism, however effective it was in some circumstances, was never the grand thing that its advocates pictured it as being. No man ever lived unto himself alone. The towering individual who allegedly wrung singlehanded success from a hostile environing situation is largely mythical and belongs in the category of the Paul Bunyans and the John Henrys. In a thousand ways every man is subsidized by the past, indebted to the present, and draws heavy drafts on the future. We are discovering that there are no natural or economic laws that work automatically for the good of all when each works for the good of himself. The individual is dying; the social person is in process of birth.

Another trend that seems to me to be most hopeful is the general recognition that is now being given to the effectiveness of corporate enterprise and effort as contrasted with individual enterprise and effort. We must not allow the current identification of corporate actions with ruthless totalitarian regimes to blind us to the demonstrable achievements of corporate action in democratic society. Nor must we allow the sentiment attached to the corner grocery cause us to forget the innumerable other corners that the old system of individual enterprise could never serve. Men united can do what men singly could never achieve. The power of social persons harnessed to corporate structures could remake our world in one generation. Blind as man has been, he is not so blind that he cannot see this possibility.

A third trend of large proportions and possibilities is that the responsibility for the well-being of persons and society is coming to be regarded by enlightened people everywhere as a permanent function of government. As a collective instrument of social action, government is corporate action par excellence. This has been demonstrated particularly in the field of public welfare. Never again can any government be called a satisfactory gov-

ernment so long as its citizens are ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed. Henceforth, parties and platforms will vie with each other in meeting social needs, and no party can long endure that commits itself to special privileges for a chosen few. The government exists for the citizens, not the citizens for the government.

Despite current reversions to social myths, notwithstanding the theory of autarchy, and even in the very face of unprecedented international conflicts, it can be said confidently that the present-day world is growing a planetary sense which is producing in increasing abundance a citizenry able to rise above ethnic and national provincialism to citizenship in a world community. We have at least begun to think and feel and plan in world terms.

Thus equipped with effective assets and instrumentalities, and in accord with well-established trends, we should now tackle with courage and persistence the problems that await solutions at the hands of the new citizens of a new world.

The road ahead is not an easy one. There are evil men and still more evil forces that must be conquered before we can concentrate exclusively on the solution of the more basic problems that confront us. But the way will be cleared so that free men and men of good will everywhere in the world can once again have a chance to solve their common problems and to work out their common salvation. The darkness will be dispelled and the dawn will again appear.

But that dawn will mean nothing to us, these marvelous assets will be of no avail, and the hopeful trends will be abortive, unless we solve certain basic problems; among them, the problem of motivation, which we must solve in a way that will release the deeper emotions and channel them socially; the problem of a pattern of life,—one that will resolve conflicts, unify intelligence and desire, and put radiance into the business of living; and the problem of a form of society rooted in the needs of, and doing justice to the aspirations of, human nature in a way that neither capitalism nor socialism does or can.

The problem of motivation is one that has always been of concern to religious people, and now it is a primary concern of experts in the field of psychiatry. The most favorable environing possibilities, the most lavish personal equipment, and the most abundant instruments of action are dependent on the release of behavior in the direction of goals that are inwardly approved. We must somehow get at the inner spring of being in a way that will utilize for social purposes the enormous resources of the human spirit. The human race has been so inhibited and restricted by customs and institutions that only in rare instances have exceptional persons broken the taboos and risen to creative heights. Down deep in the caverns of the human soul there are powers not yet reached. It is the business of religion to tap these depths; and with the aid of modern psychiatric knowledge this can yet be done.

It is in this area of motivation that religion can offer its services in full confidence that its contribution is of unequalled importance. Religion offers love or, if you prefer, good will as its grand contribution to the problem of motivation. Beyond truth and greater than justice is the motivation of love, of affection, of good will. This we know full well; but it is apparent that we do not yet know how to make this motivation effective in the market place, in the realm of international affairs, and in the rebuilding of culture in accord with patterns of the ideal. I do not claim that unimplemented love will solve the problems of the world; but I do claim that without the motivation of love the other things that are needed for a full life will never be found. Intelligence, knowledge, love—these three, but the greatest of these is love. This greatest of all motives will yet come into play on a scale that will put cynicism to flight, give wings to courage, and make radiant all other goods.

Granted the high motive of love, we must proceed to the problem of producing a life pattern that will unify and give purpose to a disorganized generation. No one can doubt that at least one of the causes of the present upset condition of the world is to be found in the crack-up of the older cultural and philosophical patterns. We need a new synthesis of values based on a realistic analysis of human needs, and an inclusive synthesis of human hopes. Such a pattern must include the whole scope of human life. The old bifurcation of the physical and the spiritual, the sacred and the secular, and the like, must be woven into a unified whole.

A philosophical pattern that will do for our day what the older ones did for their day will need to give us a sense of being at home in the universe, of being organic to our world, of possessing the means to live effectively, and of having access to the beauty of the world. The material for such a philosophy of life is available. It but remains for this material to be woven into a pattern of such consistency that it will command our intellects and of such beauty that it will arouse our deepest emotions.

But if we are to build a world that will satisfy our heart's desire—and it is my abiding premise that we can and will do this—then we must not dwell only in the rarefied atmosphere of love, nor gaze only at a pattern of perfection. We face, finally, the problem of building a form of society that will concretize the ideal in terms of food and shelter and clothes, and of aesthetic and spiritual goods.

Let us be frank with ourselves. No form of society yet evolved has proved itself fully in terms of the quality and abundance of the physical and spiritual goods that man needs and must have for a satisfactory life. Patriarchal and feudal systems failed. Industrial capitalism has failed. There is good reason to believe that socialism does not do full justice to all the requirements of

human nature. And totalitarianism obviously outrages our sense of liberty and humanity

I cannot believe that human ingenuity is exhausted in the various social forms that have been tried and found wanting. We need and we shall yet create a form of society that will produce and distribute the abundance that earth makes possible and that science and technology make easy; that will give security to each under his own vine and fig tree; that will take maximum advantage of corporate possibilities; and that will foster the freedom for all, without which no form of society is worth building or preserving.

Believing as I do in the fundamental integrity of man, and in the power of intelligence motivated by love, I look with zestful confidence to the glow of the rising sun on a grand new world.

Masaryk—An Unforgettable Character

HENRY HERBATSCHEK

Thomas Garrigue Masaryk was born in 1850. He was the son of a coachman on one of Kaiser Franz Joseph's estates. His mother was of German origin. Young Masaryk was educated in a parochial school of the co-educational type. His youth was hard, while working as a locksmith in Vienna, Austria, and he would read secretly after the day's work. One day he quit his employment and walked home, which took him about fifteen hours. He succeeded in getting the pastor's support to study in the city, because of his irresistible hunger to learn. By that time he was fifteen years old. He picked up foreign languages wherever he could and soon was able to speak German, French, English, and Russian. After graduation he became a tutor and travelled with his pupil through Europe.

At the University of Leipzig he met an American student, Charlotte Garrigue, and accompanied her on a trip to the United States. Three months later he got permission from her parents to marry her. They returned to Europe, a young couple without employment. In 1874 Masaryk became a teacher in Prague, where he published his first book, *The Suicide As a Social Appearance of the Masses.* This booklet caused a great excitement at the time.

As a thoroughly modern teacher he founded "The University Extensions" for the working people. As a sociologist he said: "The aim of sociology, as of the other social sciences, is to make human phenomena intelligible and, as far as possible, controllable." He wrote about John Huss, the gallant successor of John Wiclif.

Like Huss, Masaryk was a fighter for right and conscience. His motto was: "The truth conquers!"

I was called upon to translate his lectures "The Ideals of Humanity" from Czech into German. The book contains the basis of a philosophical system from the point of view of a modern scientist. Love and humanity are to dictate the life that no human being can do without. We call nature kind and beautiful although we see that she can be cruel sometimes. People without love and humanity cease to be "human." Try to extinguish mercy, pity, and love, then there will be recklessness and barbarism in the world. Masaryk struggled against the partisans of those scientists and politicians who never forgot their own interests behind their great ideals. He courageously founded a party "The Czech Realists." In the Austrian Parliament he challenged the official foreign policy. The government neglected the Czechs, who were proud of their past, of the great cultural achievements, of their composers Smetana and Dvorak. They longed for a constitution, but the conservatives loathed every sort of "federalism." Masaryk warned the government of the intended occupation of Bosnia. But in vain. He visited Russia, the Balkan people, and Hungary. The World War broke out. Masaryk was bound to play a decisive role in his people's struggle for independence.

In London he organized in coöperation with Benes the fight for liberty. He held meetings in New York, Cleveland, Boston. The American Czechs supported the organization from the beginning. In 1915 he began to create the "Czech Legions" in Russia. He travelled by rail and on horseback to Siberia, and then returned to the United States.

We Slavs, he told me once, are a soft, tender nation. It is remarkable that especially the soft people are apt to get revolutionary. But they are more religious and they have an ethic innate.

All his life he was a humble personality of noble character. As a poor cottage-teacher and as chief of the government he was always the same. Live cleanly, he wrote, obey the laws of ethics. A moral man is always humble and grateful, indulgent, never excited. Do not be afraid, because only the coward is afraid. Anthropos, the Greek "man", means upright! The upright man is never afraid. Fear leads to lies. Masaryk had a tall, slim figure, very mild, blue eyes and fine hands. He loved children. A picture on a Czech stamp shows him with a smiling girl in his arms.

At a meeting, a deputy spoke about democracy and explained that it means liberty of all citizens, independence, and free press. The endeavor to convince the enemies of the high meaning of this would be futile. But Masaryk answered: "The speaker is mistaken. Democracy is discussion!"

Once in the Parliament he was visited by some canvassers and salesmen, poor people who asked for an amendment of the tax law, and one of them pointed out that the representatives should think humanly about it. "Why," said Masaryk, "in this house there are no human beings, here are only 'parties'!"

When he was eighty-four he made up his mind to resign. Meanwhile the country had developed in all respects and flourished splendidly. The resignation was the sign of his high spirit and responsibility.

The excellent man is dead. The country is not independent any longer. But his memory is alive forever. He dedicated his life to his beloved people and to the country, without personal interest. He devoted his spiritual forces to the task: to teach, to improve, to awaken, to uplift his people, and to make his country free.

He was a self-made man, a great philosopher and teacher, a statesman and soldier, a generous gentleman, the true father of his nation.

Good Will and Intellectual Power

VICTOR S. YARROS

The horrors we are witnessing these days cannot fail to cause much anxious searching of hearts and minds. The old question, "What ails the so-called civilized races of men?" must spontaneously put itself to all thinking persons again and again. Are we too stupid, too short-sighted, to adjust ourselves to our circumstances and solve our economic and social problems, the problems which have made for wholesale murder and incredible cruelty and fiendishness? Renan said that he derived his notion of infinity from the "infinitude of human folly"; but is not that observation contradicted daily and hourly by the striking evidence of human ingenuity and human capacity afforded by radio, aviation, television, the techniques of production and transportation?

Certainly our inventors, engineers, accountants, statisticians, and industrialists are not stupid. The lawyers who frame our laws, and who teach our corporations and utilities to circumvent those laws, are not lacking in astuteness and resourcefulness. Our advertisers are clever enough, and our architects astonish us by their boldness and originality. No, the root of our troubles and disorders cannot be ignorance and stupidity.

Are we deficient in imagination? Again the answer is "No." Our scientists and our artists, our explorers and research workers, possess plenty of imagination.

What, then, *do* we so woefully lack?

Prof. Frederick Woodbridge, in his last book, *Essay on Nature,* sadly declares that "we need more intellectual honesty these days." Why "these days"? When *did* mankind possess enough intellectual honesty? In the days of the Inquisition? When men were burned at the stake for theological heresies? Intellectual honesty has always been very rare—the Darwins and Wallaces are few and far between. However, an age like ours, an age of moral confusion and the worship of success, is unquestionably in need of much more intellectual honesty—and intellectual humility—than we can claim to possess. And, clearly, intelligence and scientific knowledge do *not* guarantee any increase in intellectual integrity.

Did not Aristotle go deeper into the question than Professor Woodbridge when he said that "man, if he have no virtue, is the most savage and unholy of animals"? The kind of war now being waged in the Old World superabundantly exemplifies the savagery of men who have no virtue. The shocking brutalities of the concentration camps and the merciless persecutions of racial and religious minorities attest the total absence of virtue and humanity in the tyrannical rulers responsible for them.

But what is virtue? Not *knowledge* certainly. The brutes in power are unmoral, or amoral, but they know what they are doing, and are not ashamed or contrite.

Virtue is another name for good will, for sympathy and kindliness, for the sentiment of brotherhood, of oneness with other human beings. Millions of terrorized Germans and Italians have their share of good will, but the ruling cliques must be moral monsters, apes in human forms. *Their* behavior is inexplicable on any other hypothesis. Men of good will would reverse the present policies of the brutalitarian States—there can hardly be any doubt of that. Men of good will *shall* reverse them in time.

Meanwhile the nations that still remain decently civilized and decently humane must ponder the bitter lessons of the rebarbarization and degradation of so many governments and ruling cliques. If virtue *can* be so completely lost, or left out of certain natures, what can we do, what must we do, to build and nourish it, to prevent its decline and submergence, and, further, to render it impossible for wicked, sadistic, and predatory men to seize power and secure absolute control of the destinies of nations?

That Nazism and Fascism are symptoms of grave social disorders is generally recognized. That statesmen in countries still free and reasonably healthy committed reckless blunders and crimes, which prepared the soil for the aggressors and super-gangsters, is indisputable. But these considerations need not be elaborated here. The vital point that concerns us is this: How is good will cultivated, encouraged, fostered, and spread? What can *education* do toward that end? Our schools and colleges have almost totally neglected that function. Lectures on physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy, history, and like sciences do little for character building. Commercialized and vulgarized sport does even less. Even the so-called social sciences, and the humanities, can be, and indeed have been, so poorly taught in our educational institutions that their potential civilizing and humanizing effect has been reduced to the vanishing point. Courses in classical economics, for example, have averted very few strikes or lockouts. The stubborn and anti-union employers believe themselves to be consistent followers of Adam Smith, Ricardo, and Bastiat. Many of our sociologists take the absurd position that their science is "objective," and that they can take no sides, as if mere description and labeling of phenomena can be called science!

What authority have our social sciences, and what lawmaker or executive pays any attention to "academic" conclusions? Did not a President of the United States sign a vicious and reactionary tariff bill despite the warnings and protests of over a thousand professors of economics? Even Thomas Hobbes drily remarked that the judgments of the social sciences were heeded only when they did not threaten profits or desired pleasures. And Macauley admitted that Harvey's discovery of the circulation of blood would have been obstinately denied and flouted if economic interests had dictated such opposition thereto.

Infinitely more can be done for justice and social peace by horse sense, sound practical judgment, than by any social science provided *there be good will*—the will to discuss issues in a reasonable spirit, to entertain the opponent's view with some patience and tolerance, to put aside mere prejudice and vague antipathies and suspicions. Experience has demonstrated that in industry, as in others fields, the success of conciliation, arbitration, and tactful mediation depends on the degree of confidence one has initially in those methods. Confidence, in turn, is the fruit of habit and practice. And good habits *can* be cultivated.

Our educational policies and methods need to be revised and reconstructed in the light of the developments of the last several decades. Undue dependence on science or the intellect has led to the neglect of the emotions. The training, disciplining and *taming* of some of

these must now be attacked in earnest. Without visions, nations perish; without virtue, individuals, groups, classes, and nations relapse into savagery. To realize these truths is not to despair of humanity, but to turn systematically to new ways and means of building character and virtue. The churches, like the schools, must play their part in the work of reorganizing education and molding human character. Certain modest social and cultural agencies, relatively new, will require aid and attention. The essential thing is to face the old problem soberly and candidly.

It is strange but true that few of our Humanists have faced it in the right way. There has been considerable talk lately of "scientific" Humanism, as distinguished from religious or mystical Humanism. An eminent and thoughtful British liberal has even advised us to restate the gospel of Jesus in modern, non-theological, and scientific terms in order to give it more effectiveness in an age of skepticism and positivism. Humanism *is* scientific. But it is not science that makes one fall in love with the ideals and objectives of Humanism. Love your neighbor as part of yourself is perfectly good science, despite the verdict of some psychoanalytic schools upon the unconscious. Altruism is as natural as egoism, mutual aid as self-interest. But what can science do where there *is* no love for the neighbor, when, indeed, hate governs conduct? Goodness and kindliness need the light of science. But where goodness and kindliness are absent, that light will not be sought.

The modern temper may be skeptical and positivist, but do those qualities banish love and implant hate? Is good will a concomitant of credulity and ignorance? Justice, mercy, and humility are not ideas merely, they are also sentiments. On them and with them scientific Humanism can be built. But they are not to be taken for granted. To repeat, our problem today is just the problem of ways and means of generating and fostering these sentiments. All other problems are secondary, to say the least. Solve the basic, the paramount, problem, and the solutions of all the others will, because of our intelligence and our technology, prove to be an easy task.

It may not be wholly superfluous to remind the younger generation that the social settlement movement and social work generally are attributable primarily to good will and secondarily to intelligence. It will be recalled that John Ruskin, in starting his St. George colony, was animated by the irresistible urge to do what lay in his power for the disinherited, oppressed, and neglected classes. As he said, the social and economic injustices which he witnessed rendered him so wretched and so indignant that he could not wait a week or a day but was constrained to go to work at once and set an example of humane and just organization of society. Jane Addams, Lillian Wald, Mary MacDowell, Arnold Toynbee, and other eminent social workers might have used Ruskin's language to describe their respective decisions to establish social settlements for the benefit of the poor, downtrodden, exploited, and bewildered inhabitants of slums. The social worker is a Humanist first of all; he wants to serve and help. He is emphatically his brother's keeper. He must do what he can to ameliorate, assuage, improve, correct things. He may have a radical philosophy, but he is also a pragmatist. He is interested in immediate and practical problems. He is benevolent, sensitive, tender-hearted, and he hates cruelty and injustice. He is a scientific Humanist, however, and old-fashioned charity does not satisfy him.

The spirit of the social settlement can and must be carried, as Jane Addams carried it, into the larger spheres of national and international relations. Totalitarianism kills good will; and good will, guided by intelligence, will destroy totalitarianism.

Freedom for India

HILDA WIERUM BOULTER

Too few people in Europe or America have any comprehension of or sympathy for the Indian patriot. There are many reasons for this, some more obvious than others. First of all, India is, even in these days of rapid communication, still very remote. Secondly, there is almost no understanding of the Gandhian doctrine of non-violence—it is mistaken for weakness, making a virtue of necessity, or expediency, for *passive* pacifism. Whereas, in reality, it is no one of these things but the unleashing of a mighty force, to explain which would take pages and pages. Thirdly, all that we know of British rule nearer home is good. We in America immediately think of our neighbor to the north. We do not realize that the Dominion of Canada has little governmental kinship to the Imperial possession—India. Also, what little we know of India is largely from British sources, and naturally and inevitably favorable to the British. Moreover, America has a predominantly Christian population—and it is a melancholy truth that most of organized Christianity suffers from a very definite superiority complex.

All of the above reasons for the lack of comprehension of India are almost equally true in Europe. Europe has very nearly the same picture of India that America has, except that all of Europe does not share our blind and rather naive admiration for Britain. Europe views her island neighbor with a rather more adult gaze. She recognizes all the truly great and admirable qualities of the English, but she is aware of other qualities, too. Nor has Europe our childlike faith in the protestations of national orators. She knows that well-turned phrases and noble sentiments are too often but the trappings of strategy, political finesse, and diplomacy. She appreciates them—Ah, yes!—but more realistically. Even so, one finds that in Europe the matter of Indian national aspirations is rather lightly passed over, which is natural enough since nearly all of Europe either has such possessions as India—or would like to have them. It would be hardly politic for any European government to make an issue of this matter. Moreover, Europe is thoroughly imbued with the Christian superiority complex—and with the other superiority complex which concerns power diplomacy. For one reason or another, those nations and peoples who are neither Christian, nor militarily powerful, are dubbed inferior, and what happens to them is of little moment.

America should be in a different case. She stands for equality, at least of opportunity. Her history is

one of a struggle to obtain and to maintain political, religious, and social freedom. She, at least, should be above this belittling of the desire for freedom of another people, however far away, however little understood. Can it be that here there is another, perhaps subconscious, reason for apathy regarding the fate of India? Can it be that in this country, where once a war was fought which endangered our very national existence, partly for the freedom of dark-skinned slaves, that the dark skins of Indians help to make their cause unimportant? Can it be that President Roosevelt's noble words only apply to white, Christian European "resolute people" who are resisting aggression? Or can it be that the only human rights that need be supreme are those of white, Christian Europeans—who do not happen, in their struggle to gain and keep those rights, to be pitted against the British, whose friendship is so valuable to America?

If it is true that America's aid is indispensable to Britain—and we are certainly being led to believe that this is the case—and if it is true, as the President says, that our support goes to those "everywhere" who struggle to gain those human rights whose supremacy means freedom, then we have a duty to perform: a duty which we cannot shirk, under pain of being false to our faith and to all that we hold most dear. That duty is to say plainly and baldly to the British Government: We no more recognize your right to hold India against the will of the Indian people, than we or you recognized the right of other aggressors to hold Poland against the will of the Polish people. It makes no difference how long you already have held India—except insofar as each day that you stay there increases the magnitude of the injustice done the Indian people. India is a large country with a huge population and great potential wealth and strength. Given proper *support* during the crucial period of initial independence, it could become self-defending in a very short time, and would constitute no menace to future peace. The much discussed communal problems of the Hindus and Moslems are for the Hindus and Moslems to settle—they are not your business, nor ours. They have grown in intensity since the beginning of foreign rule—your rule. Your financial tie-ups, your investments in India can all be equitably arranged—in time. We are willing to be on a commission to help settle such matters, if necessary. But, we insist that you give freedom to India now, that you help in the substitution of an Indian national government for your own aggressor rule, that you honestly and decently withdraw,—we insist upon this as the price of our further assistance to you in your struggle against aggression. We cannot support you while you are still maintaining in India a government of aggression against the will of the people of India. We must feel that our hands are clean. We cannot so feel if we are partners with you, whose hands are as stained with crime in India as other hands are stained with crime in Europe.

To some this may sound Utopian, naive, a very undiplomatic pipe dream. It is not any one of these things. It is a perfectly practical suggestion. The Indian National Congress could easily provide the framework of a national government. Furthermore, this suggestion has the merit of going straight to the root of most of the trouble, even in Europe. For from the lips of responsible Englishmen themselves we have it that India really *is* the Empire. It is the most fundamental thing about it. The rest is the British Commonwealth of Nations—an excellent and worthy creation. India is the slave nation on which the British Empire rests. And it is fear of and jealousy of this Empire which has been the underlying cause of most of the wars since England first acquired India,—acquired her by methods not so very unlike those which we decry when employed by Germans today. Economic penetration, trickery of all sorts, subversion of the servants of the state, followed by military expeditions. This is the record, plain for all to see, of the East India Company. The Company was not the British Government, true, but until its conduct became too obviously flagrant to be tolerated with safety, it was approved by the government. And the government, by way of righting the wrongs done India by "John Company," quite simply took over the whole affair—and proceeded complacently to accept the fruits of the Company's dishonest labors! And this is the antecedent history of that Empire which America is now asked to support. Worse still, it is history which is being carried on into the present.

If this war is to settle anything at all, there must first be a settlement of the imperial system. And India is the very cornerstone of the whole system. If we really believe that in the justice of our cause lies our strength, we cannot permit any miscarriage of that justice. If America is to trust her safety to arms, her own or those of others, which derive their strength from any moral fervor, she must be as sure of the morality as of the fervor.

Hitler's strength lies in the faith of his people that he is fighting *for* something. If we really fight for freedom we can have a like faith. As it is, the dark shadow of Imperialism makes a mockery of our claims. The sufferings and sorrows of those sons and daughters of India who now languish in prisons because they struggled to free their own homeland from British rule, are a weight around the neck of every British soldier—and will be a weight on the soul of every American, unless we speak out honestly and fearlessly, and insist that justice be done *"everywhere."*

Free India!

While India remains in bond
The soul of the world is bound.
Of other lands you may be fond,
But Ind is holy ground.

To see the others, look around.
For India look within.
A crime to hold another in pound.
To fetter Ind is sin.

She asks for only what is due,
The freedom others vaunt.
But, India, we turn to you
For dreams that none can daunt:

That love be law, and joy the goal,
And gentleness conquer wrong,
With holiness an aureole,
And the humble proven the strong.

RALPH CHEYNEY.

A Pro-American Thinks Aloud

HELEN B. ANTHONY

The Peace Council in our town was holding a meeting at the International Institute. The president, a fervent young pacifist, a lawyer of good social position, who is willing to sacrifice all for his principles, introduced the speaker to some hundred Italian-American men and women. He was kind; he was almost chummy, as he said:

> We are happy to come to the International Institute. It gives us an opportunity to meet people we would not otherwise meet. You have heard the story of the man who had never seen a horse. He thought a horse had five legs. But when he saw a horse he saw for himself that it had only four. So it is with us Americans; we hear about Italians being gangsters and criminals and we build up certain pictures about Italians in our minds. But when we come here and meet you face to face, we find you are just people like ourselves!

The cultured Italian woman who had arranged the meeting grew hot from head to foot. She was too well-bred to say anything. She told me afterward that she dared not look around at her group; fortunately the lawyer spoke in rapid English, fortunately he said what he said with an ingratiating manner, fortunately most of those present took the good will at face value without examining the content of his remarks.

This incident is significant because it is not an isolated case of the stupidity of Americans working for reforms. For twenty years I have been in the peace movement and for ten of those years I have been telling peace organizations that we shall never educate our country to avoid the causes of war between nations while we fail to seek the understanding of and coöperation with minority groups within our nation.

A good church member of means trains a Negro choir. He pays for a director, he treats the singers to refreshments at rehearsals, he really does know and appreciate Negro music. To present the choir to the public, he issues invitations. He and his wife receive the guests in evening clothes, graciously. It is true that the singers themselves have some invitations to give to their friends. It is true, also, that there is no discrimination in seating the audience in the hall at the Y. W. C. A. engaged for the evening. But, in personal conversation he says that "all colored people must be treated as children" including specifically the leading social worker, a man of culture and wisdom whom men and women of all nationality backgrounds respect.

In the days of prohibition a social worker came to the W. C. T. U. "You think it is deplorable that so many Polish families sell bootleg liquor," she said. "Come with me and I will introduce you to some of the Polish women of these families. You will find them very clean and very good mothers. When you get to know them you can tell them why the prohibition law was passed and that all Americans are not like the ones who make selling bootleg liquor profitable." The good W. C. T. U.'ers never went.

Anyone reading this magazine can multiply these examples many times. My reason for citing them is that I am a first-generation American of Scotch parentage, that I am very pro-American, and that I deplore the influence which the British have upon our thinking. If many of the speakers and writers from Great Britain spoke in a language with only a slight accent, they would be shipped out of the United States by the next boat.

Our gullibility to everything British I attribute to two things: our lack of knowledge of the cultural background of Americans not British, and our over-emphasis on knowledge of everything British.

A Jewish woman in our town is working frantically for everything being done for Britain. She is a person who has always been sensitive about the place of the Jew in the community, afraid that the "foreign" Jew would prejudice non-Jews against the whole group. I said to her:

> Can you not see that the British pattern is what is delaying appreciation of Jews as Jews? The Jews have color and life and an Oriental love of the dramatic. Why should not that be accepted as part of the vivid pattern of our new America? Because we take the British pattern of restraint and formality as the measure by which we judge the manners of all Americans. My ancestors came from a land of sparsity; they are inclined to be dour and clannish; they are thrifty because they have found it hard to make a living in the little isles of Britain. What warmth they have comes from their Latin strains from Europe. Why should all Americans want to pattern their behavior on them?

There has been peace between the United States and Canada for over 120 years. Many of us who live on the border spend our summers in our sister country. We have a great affection for Canada. Not only do we like those things which are like our own environment, but we like the European atmosphere which subtly pervades the customs of the people.

It is too easy to say that this understanding between the two nations is due to like standards. Because we have the same language we do not have to make much effort to understand one another. If we were to examine the whole of Canada and the whole of the United States we would find a wide variance not only between the countries but within the countries.

We have peace between Canada and the United States, I believe, because we have the "will to peace." When Canada prohibits spending money in our country and our merchants on the border are hard hit by the loss of a large Canadian trade, we grumble a bit but accept it.

Canada and the United States were once enemies. But I like to think that the early colonists came to a new continent because they were tired of the ways of the old country. They decided it was unnecessary to fight over differences which might arise, and with the Rush-Bagot Treaty ended war along a long border.

Since our nation has decided that we must save Great Britain in order to save ourselves, we newer Americans must see that prejudice and bigotry do not ride rampant over the land, that our fellow-Americans of German or Italian parentage are not punished for the accident of their birth.

And if we are truly patriotic, if we are truly pro-American above allegiance to any other land, we must make it our business to foster understanding between diverse groups within our own country. If we do not understand each other, we Americans who believe in democracy, how can we ever expect to bring peace to the world?

Reform movements of all kinds within communities should seek and obtain the coöperation of all ethnic groups. When we get this coöperation on a small scale—which can be done only by basic education—then, and not until then, can we begin to hope for reform in the world at large.

Democracy

ELMO A. ROBINSON

Democracy is an ideal, never completely realized, always in process of arriving, always to be striven for.

Democracy is an accomplishment, nourished by the sacrifices of our forefathers, rooted in the labor and learning and loyalty of heroes and common people.

Democracy is a tradition, a tradition of liberty in the realm of the spirit—liberty in thought, in religion, in the spoken and printed word, in political activity—freed from all tyranny of censorship.

Democracy is a living force, at work today in countless legislatures, conferences, forums, committees, and wherever the people freely assemble to discuss their grievances, their hopes, and the solution of their common problems.

Democracy is the foe of uniformity; it seeks opportunity for each man to develop his own talents, to do his own thinking, to live his own life, to be spontaneous, creative, individual.

Democracy is the foe of exploitation; it seeks equality for its citizens in their relationships to their government, justice, happiness, and the good life for all. It challenges any who wear the cloak of pretended democracy to hide selfish ambition and special privilege.

Democracy is natural; it is human nature to live and work and play and think together, to minimize conflict, to permit neither superman nor underdog to mar the fraternity of men and of nations.

Democracy must be learned; there shall be preachers of its ideals and traditions, there shall be schools where democracy is practiced, there shall be laboratories where young and old may learn the ways of tolerance and liberty.

Democracy is a form of government, preëxistent in a Declaration of Independence, incarnate in a Constitution, vitalized in a Bill of Rights, and made manifest by the activities of juryman and judge, legislator and clerk, policeman and president.

Democracy is a way of life for individual men and women, a way of living which requires intelligence, understanding, patience, and repeated reconsecration.

May I have faith that in the coming years men will increasingly understand and accept this democracy. May I ever aid and never hinder its success. May I recognize my prejudices and seek their elimination. May I listen with respect when my opponents speak sincerely, and reply with thoughtful argument. May I do my share of the drudgery of democracy by participation in the affairs of organizations which I believe to be essential for the welfare of my country and my community. May I seek no unearned and undeserved privileges for me and mine. May I never ape the dictators, but rather regard myself as one who serves the best interests of all who occupy positions subordinate to mine. May I become so proficient in the practice of democracy that others, observing my example, will have no need for my precept.

Heroes of Peace

EDMUND L. SOUDER

At Boulder Dam, that mighty work of man's creative genius, which is bringing power, light, irrigation, and a more abundant economic life over a wide area of the far West, there is a tablet erected to the memory of the eighty-nine workmen who were killed in accidents during the construction of the gigantic engineering enterprise. On the monument are the words: "For those who died that the desert might bloom."

It is right that on Memorial Day each year we should remember gratefully such Heroes of Peace along with those who have been slain in battle. If we pay our homage to the soldier who falls in the line of duty, so also should we honor the memory of the thousands of civilians who, yearly, surrender their lives in faithful and often heroic performance of duty.

Too often, however, these Peace Heroes are forgotten by the nation they served, and their courageous achievements go unsung. As the American tourist travels about the country, visiting parks, plazas, and public places, most of the monuments he sees are erected in honor of General This and Admiral That. *Far* fewer are the statues of creative leaders—statesmen, musicians, painters, engineers, physicians, scholars, and workmen—who served their country in the arts of peace. To be sure, the Capitol in Washington has recently been embellished by a statue of Huey P. Long, but that scarcely helps.

I was led to meditate on the disparity of honor accorded war and peace heroes some years ago on a visit to England. As I walked through St. Paul's Cathedral, London, visiting the tombs of Lord Nelson and the Duke of Wellington, and saw monument after monument erected to notable fighters, the whole building seemed to become a symbol of the religious glorification of the military might of the British Empire, and I felt more at ease later on in the Poets' Corner in Westminster Abbey.

To the men who, in sincerity and sacrifice, died in battle, symbolized best by the Unknown Soldier, we render our meed of homage, but we would also acknowledge our great indebtedness to those of our fellow citizens who, with equal courage and faithfulness, have lost their lives in peacetime pursuits.

Word came recently of one more ghastly tragedy among those whose dangerous and unromantic toil warms our homes and turns the wheels of our factories. Fourteen charred bodies of miners, victims of a terrific explosion that dropped them in their tracks, seared by waves of flame, had been returned from 325 feet below ground to their grief-stricken families. Yet how many Americans this Memorial Day will pause to remember before God these men and the one thousand and forty miners who in one year (1940) lost their lives, often under circumstances as agonizing as those on a battlefield, and how many orators will speak a word for the extraordinary courage of the humble men and boys who, at imminent risk of death from gas fumes, smoke, or cave-ins, go down into the bowels of the earth to seek the rescue of trapped fellow workers. Such Peace Heroes surely deserve the respectful honor of their compatriots,

and yet the southern coal operators have only recently heartlessly fought recognition of an old Welsh tradition whereby mine workers hold "memorial periods," or a day of mourning every year for their comrades killed in mine disasters.

Some years ago there was a revolting revelation of how *many* workers at Gauley Bridge, West Virginia, had died or were slowly dying of silicosis, contracted owing to the criminal failure of the company to provide proper safety devices for the men as they drove a tunnel through silica deposits. Such fatalities in industry are many, and are incurred by men engaged in producing goods and services for the community.

No great engineering project is brought to completion without claiming the lives of some of the workers, and the engineers who lay plans for such works as the Oakland-San Francisco Bridge, the Norris Dam, or a skyscraper, are able, through the law of averages, to compute pretty accurately beforehand just about how many lives will be sacrificed before the task is ended.

Furthermore, every year supplies its quota of heroic men and women who give their lives directly in the effort to save others—firemen and policemen, physicians and nurses, lifeguards and ordinary citizens who, in drownings and other kinds of accidents "lay down their lives for their friends." Do you remember the movie "Yellow Jack," and the thrilling story it told of Dr. Reed and his collaborators in the courageous fight against the dread yellow fever? In that picture one character says truly, "There must be an ideal in the heart of a man who sets out to look after the health of his fellow men and not their destruction."

By no means least on our Roll of Honor of Peace Heroes are those brave women who are forever entering the valley of the shadow of death, and sometimes remain there, in the noble adventure of Motherhood.

A few years ago, in an Armistice Day speech, the head of an American preparatory school said of the school alumni who had been killed in 1917-18: "Not once while they were here had the thought entered anyone's head that they would be called upon to serve their country." What an astonishing constriction of the content of "service to one's country," for what he meant, of course, was that as schoolboys the students had no idea that they would later be drafted into the army and compelled to go out and shoot other boys! Surely all true Americans want to "serve their country," but we can thank God that there are almost limitless opportunities for doing this, and for promoting the common weal other than through entrance into the army, navy, or marine corps! The phrase frequently used in these days, "He has entered the service" fully applies to the millions who in civilian paths of productive endeavor and in works of mercy and social welfare "serve" the nation, and on this Memorial Day, 1941, distressed by daily reports of the agony and dying in warfare of our brethren of other lands, we fervently pray that the slaughter of war may cease, and that our people, with God's children overseas, may be permitted to serve one another in constructive, productive ways of peace!

I Want To Be Happy

The only way for me to be happy is to try to make others happy, to try to serve the greatest good for the greatest number. This is the highest, broadest, and deepest ambition of which I know.

I believe in love as the only way to live—love of all that is beautiful, that is kind, that is noble.

I must try to understand all people and to love them, even though I must irreconcilably condemn and combat some of the things that they and I do.

I believe that many kinds of animals experience pleasure and pain. All these must be considered in my conduct in proportion to how deeply they can feel.

My way of life must contain continuous effort toward knowledge and understanding; continuous and unlimited work and struggle; willingness to suffer and be misunderstood where unavoidable; and continuous ability to relax and to see the humor in all things, and so to refresh my strength, vision, and love.

CHARLES H. WELLMAN.

To W. H. Auden

Not in our time, no, not while our days linger
Will the construction of this error be destroyed.
Not now, nor tomorrow, nor in the next decade,
Not in our generation can this error be overthrown.
There is no flood, no tidal wave sufficient,
No earthquake, avalanche, no cataclysm.
Error is not overcome by miracle.

You and I have watched the error growing
And the dark mounting. We have seen the shadow
Glazing the eyes of our fathers,
The shadow of a beam in the sight of their fathers.
We were begot in the wing of that shadow;
Nourished on that blindness, on those glazed eyes turning
Without focus in their sockets; taught to paint over
Our own seeing with that same darkness.
The darkness flaked from our pupils,
Cracked off and let the staring error through.
This made us bitter, full of gall:
Millions starving for corn and millions of ears wasted;
Millions shivering for clothes and the looms glutted;
Millions frozen for houses and buildings empty.

It will be long coming:
Few realize; they are long changing,
Though the time is ripe for the destruction of this error.
Error has been formed by the fathers slowly, half blind,
Through years and conflicts and cycles.
Error will be razed by the children with feet dragging,
Hands groping, minds dazed and uncertain;
Decade by decade will they take it down,
Decision by decision.
And the children's children will clear the waste likewise.

ALBERT AND HELEN FOWLER.

The Study Table

Unity in Religious Pluralism

THE RELIGIONS OF DEMOCRACY. *By Louis Finkelstein, J. Elliot Ross, and William Adams Brown. New York: Devin-Adair Company.* 241 *pp.* $2.00.

Sharing the viewpoint that Jews, Catholics, and Protestants in Europe, by standing aloof from one another, have in some countries fallen victims of pagan, totalitarian forces, three American theologians, representing the principal faiths in American democracy, have joined in the writing of a volume that seeks to state and explain in popular terms the faith of each group.

The book, entitled *The Religions of Democracy,* was undertaken by the three religious leaders in the hope that it would lead to better understanding among Americans generally and help to head off in this country the antagonisms which divided the populations of nations elsewhere. The book represents the first joint publication of its kind.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary; Father J. Elliot Ross, prominent Catholic preacher and former teacher of moral theology at Catholic University; and Dr. William Adams Brown, professor of applied theology at Union Theological Seminary, are the authors. They explain the doctrine, creed, and living principles of their faith in the coöperative venture. The volume is sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in line with its objective of creating better understanding and coöperation among Americans of all faiths.

In a preface, Dr. Robert A. Ashworth, editorial secretary of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, declares:

> If Jews, Catholics, and Protestants are to live happily and coöperatively together, it is imperative that they should understand one another. Such understanding will disclose, on the one hand, the limitations and, on the other, the possibilities of coöperation. As Americans all, they have the same obligations as citizens of the one country and must work cordially together for the common welfare within the communities which are their common homes. Each must stand for the rights of all. Together they must resist the prejudices that would divide them and set them in hostile camps.

In this section, Dr. Finkelstein describes the historic background of the Hebrew religion, the place of study in Judaism, the system of ritual blessings, the synagogue and the prayers, the Sabbath and the Festivals, special occasions and dietary laws.

Father Ross discusses the authority of the Pope, the organization of the Catholic Church today, the attitude of the Catholic Church toward the Bible, the nature of the Catholic creed, and Catholicism in the personal and public lives of its members.

Dr. Brown describes the origin and growth of Protestantism, what Protestants generally believe about God, the nature and function of the church, the way to deal with differences of conviction, what Protestantism advocates as a way of life for its members.

JAMES M. YARD.

From Nebraska to New England

LET MY PEOPLE GO. *By Henrietta Buckmaster. New York: Harper and Brothers.* 398 *pp.* $3.50.

This is a "must" book for all who would understand America. Written in a smooth style, this fascinating book should find its way into every library, private and public, in our land. Only yesterday, the present reviewer looked at the John Brown Cabin on the Underground Railway at Nebraska City. He has visited the "stations" on the Underground Railway at Salem, Iowa, and has been in Peterboro, New York. Miss Buckmaster fills in the story from Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska to New England with the rise of the Abolitionist movement and all its contemporary feelings and ramifications. The Quakers and the Congregationalists who had never liked one another back in New England worked hand in hand on the Iowa frontier as they used the same Underground Railway. Politicians, ministers of the Gospel, poets, martyrs, prophets, writers, all from John Brown to the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* find a place in this moving story. Whittier back in New England watched their progress, as did Emerson. A rich and abundant folk-lore has grown up about the Underground Railway which, whether told in Nebraska City, or Brownville, or Salem, or Ohio, or Peterboro, never loses its charm. Everybody, even those remotely interested in America, should read this book.

C. A. HAWLEY.

THE AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION

Announces the Publication of

THE HUMANIST

A Quarterly

EDWIN H. WILSON, Editor

IN VOL. I, NO. 1 (now ready)

SOURCES OF HUMANISM IN HUMAN NATURE — JAMES H. LEUBA
HUMANISM AS A RELIGION — ROY WOOD SELLARS
A HUMANIST QUESTIONED — MAX C. OTTO
LOOKING AT LIBERTY IN A LARGE WAY — HARRY ELMER BARNES
THE HUMANIZING OF SCIENCE — SELDEN SMYZER
HAYDON MAKES THE GODS LIVE AGAIN — HORACE S. FRIES
HUMANIST ANSWERS CHRISTIAN — CURTIS W. REESE
THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF SCIENCE — FREDERICK BURKHARDT
SANTAYANA AND HUMANISM — ARCHIE J. BAHM
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RELIGIOUS HUMANISM

One Dollar Per Year

301 N. Mayfield Avenue, Chicago